

### **REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action mailed May 10, 2006. Claim 11 has been amended. Claims 1-10 and 12-17 are withdrawn. Claims 11 and 18-26 remain pending. Support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and claims and specifically on page 33 Table 1 (1-30 weight percent active enzyme composition); page 36 line 29 to page 37 line 6 (one liquid and one powder); and page 38 lines 12-15 (adding the intermediate cleaning composition to a diluent in the presence of the article to be cleaned). It is believed that no new matter is presented by the amendments.

### **Interview Summary Record**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the tremendous courtesy shown to Anneliese S. Mayer in the interview of July 11, 2006. The claims and possible amendments were discussed.

### **Objections to the Specification**

The Office Action suggests to amend the title and abstract since there are no composition claims pending at this time. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants have amended the title and abstract to call out methods of using a heterogeneous cleaning composition. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112 First Paragraph**

The Office Action rejected claims 11 and 18-26 under § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement and specifically to the language “at least 5 wt.% active enzyme composition.” Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants have amended claim 11 to call out 1-30 wt.% active enzyme composition. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Office Action has rejected the claims under § 103(a) as unpatentable in light of several prior art references. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. According to the Office Action, the prior art references read on the claims because the prior art taught diluting the composition with water. Applicants have amended claim 11 to more clearly define that there are *two* dilution steps that are separate steps. Applicants believe that claim 11 is now distinguished from the prior art of record. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

### **Summary**

It is respectfully submitted that each of the pending claims is in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is kindly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' primary attorney-of-record, Anneliese S. Mayer, at (651) 795-5661, if it is believed that prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby.

Please consider this a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME for a sufficient number of months to enter these papers or any future reply, if appropriate. Please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501257.

**43896**

PATENT EXAMINER OFFICE

Respectfully submitted,

ECOLAB INC.  
Law Department  
Mail Stop ESC-F7  
655 Lone Oak Drive  
Eagan, Minnesota 55121  
Phone Number: (651) 795-5661  
Fax Number: (651) 204-7507

Dated: August 3, 2006

By: /Anneliese S. Mayer/  
Name: Anneliese S. Mayer  
Reg. No. 54,434